## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COVIDIEN LP, et al., Plaintiffs, V.

Defendants.

BRADY ESCH, et al.,

Case No.18-mc-80063-SVK

ORDER REGARDING VENCLOSE, S MOTION TO COMBINE HEARING DATES ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS

Re: Dkt. No. 28

Currently pending before the Court are several motions concerning third-party discovery matters relating to a suit currently pending in the District of Massachusetts. ECF 1, 16, 18, 27. On May 8, 2018, third-party Venclose, Inc. ("Venclose") filed a motion to combine hearing dates on the discovery motions. ECF 28. The Court issues this order for purposes of scheduling and clarification.

Venclose states in its motion that it intends to file at least two additional discovery motions. ECF 28 at 2. Discovery in the underlying action closes June 30, 2018. ECF 3-2. In light of the number of motions and pending close of discovery, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

- 1. All parties to submit any additional matters relating to Venclose's documents or witnesses by May 16, 2018.
- 2. All such matters must be raised by joint discovery letter brief, and the Court directs the parties to its Civil Scheduling and Discovery Standing Order.
- 3. As for Venclose's pending motion regarding Mr. Przygoda, Covidien is to submit a three page letter brief in response no later than May 14, 2018; there will be no reply.
- 4. At this time, the Court does not anticipate holding a hearing for the pending discovery matters. See Civil L.R. 7-1(b). Should the Court determine a hearing is necessary, the Court will hear all matters on a single date.

## Northern District of California United States District Court

27

28

1	5. T
2	argument on per
3	
4	As a poir
5	of a magistrate j
6	the pending mot
7	U.S.C. § 636. T
8	
9	SO ORI
10	Dated: May 9, 2
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

o the extent Venclose's motion to combine hearing dates contained additional nding motions, those arguments are stricken.

nt of clarification, on April 11, 2018, a party filed a declination to the jurisdiction udge. ECF 12. The Court is not required to obtain consent of all parties to hear tions because the pending motions are nondispositive pretrial motions. See 28 Therefore, the case will remain with the undersigned magistrate judge.

## DERED.

2018

United States Magistrate Judge